

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------|
| RYAN PFLIPSEN, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | CIVIL ACTION |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | FILE No. 5:20-cv-973 |
| C. RIOS ENTERPRISES, INC., |) | |
| d/b/a 7500 ECKERT CENTER, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, RYAN PFLIPSEN, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendant C. RIOS ENTERPRISES, INC., d/b/a 7500 ECKERT CENTER, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendant’s failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff RYAN PFLIPSEN (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in San Antonio, Texas

(Bexar County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of asserting his civil rights, monitoring, ensuring, and determining whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others, and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this Property, including returning to the Property as soon as it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).”

7. Defendant C. RIOS ENTERPRISES, INC., d/b/a 7500 ECKERT CENTER (hereinafter “7500 ECKERT CENTER”) is a Texas for profit corporation that transacts business in the state of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. 7500 ECKERT CENTER may be properly served with process via its registered agent for service, to wit: Eric C. Rios, 7500 Eckert Road, Suite 400, San Antonio, Texas 78240.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. On or about August 17, 2020, Plaintiff was a customer at “Rosalita’s Mexican Restaurant” a business located at 7500 Eckert Road, San Antonio, Texas 78240, referenced herein as the “Rosalita’s.”

10. 7500 ECKERT CENTER is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that the Rosalita’s is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

11. Plaintiff lives approximately 7 miles from the Rosalita’s and Property.

12. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 7500 Eckert Road, San Antonio, Bexar County Property Identification number 225651 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Rosalita’s and Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

13. Plaintiff has visited the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property within six months or sooner, as soon as the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a regular customer, to determine if and when the Property is made accessible and to maintain standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

14. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Rosalita’s and Property to purchase goods

and/or services.

15. Plaintiff travelled to the Rosalita's and Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to access at the Rosalita's and Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Rosalita's and Property.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG

16. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

17. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to

lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and

- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

18. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

* * * * *

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

19. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

20. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

21. The Rosalita's is a public accommodation and service establishment.

22. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

23. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

24. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

25. The Rosalita's must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

26. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

27. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Rosalita's and the Property in his capacity as a customer of the Rosalita's and Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Rosalita's and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Rosalita's and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

28. Plaintiff intends to visit the Rosalita's and Property again in the very near future as a customer in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Rosalita's and Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but will be unable to fully do so because of

his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Rosalita's and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Rosalita's and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

29. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Rosalita's and Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

30. Defendant will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Rosalita's and Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Rosalita's and Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

31. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Rosalita's and Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Rosalita's and Property include, but are not limited to:

(a) ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:

- (i) Near Unit 150, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (ii) Near Unit 150, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.
- (iii) Near Unit 150, there is a vertical rise exceeding 1 inch at the base of the accessible ramp in violation of Section 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- (iv) Near Unit 150, the Property has an accessible ramp that lacks finished edges or edge protection and/or is otherwise in violation of section 405.9 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (v) Near Unit 150, there are changes in level at the accessible entrance of this Unit exceeding $\frac{1}{2}$ (one-half) inch causing the maneuvering clearance of this accessible entrance doorway to be unlevel in violation of section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Specifically, there is an approximately 1 (one) inch vertical rise at the accessible entrance, thus rendering the interior of this unit of

the Property, at best, dangerously accessible, at worst, totally inaccessible. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(vi) Due to the presence of a wooden fence near the Precinct Academy and Daycare Center, the Property lacks a single accessible route connecting accessible facilities, accessible elements and/or accessible spaces of the Property in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.

(vii) Near Unit 280, there are changes in level at the accessible entrance of this Unit exceeding $\frac{1}{2}$ (one-half) inch causing the maneuvering clearance of this accessible entrance doorway to be unlevel in violation of section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Specifically, there is an approximately 1-2 (one to two) inch vertical rise at the accessible entrance, thus rendering the interior of this unit of the Property, at best, dangerously accessible, at worst, totally inaccessible. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(viii) Near Unit 400, the accessible parking space is missing a proper identification sign in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

- (ix) Near Unit 400, there is at least one access aisle that has excessive vertical rise and is in violation of section 303.2 and 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (x) Near Unit 400, the ground surfaces of the accessible space have vertical rises in excess of $\frac{1}{4}$ (one quarter) inch in height, are not stable or slip resistant, have broken or unstable surfaces or otherwise fail to comply with Section 302, 303 and 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xi) Near Unit 400, the Property has an accessible ramp that lacks finished edges or edge protection and/or is otherwise in violation of section 405.9 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xii) Near Unit 400, the accessible ramp leading from the public sidewalk to the accessible entrances has a rise greater than 6 (six) inches but does not have handrails complying with section 505 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, this is a violation of section 405.8 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xiii) Near Unit 400, the ground surfaces at the top of the accessible ramp have vertical rises in excess of $\frac{1}{4}$ (one quarter) inch in height, are not stable or slip resistant, have broken or unstable surfaces or otherwise fail to comply with Section 302, 303 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation

would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xiv) Near Rosalita's, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xv) Near Rosalita's, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(xvi) Near Rosalita's, the Property has an accessible ramp that lacks finished edges or edge protection and/or is otherwise in violation of section 405.9 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xvii) Near Rosalita's, there are changes in level at the accessible entrance of this Unit exceeding $\frac{1}{2}$ (one-half) inch causing the maneuvering clearance of this accessible entrance doorway to be unlevel in violation of section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Specifically, there is an approximately 1 (one) inch vertical rise at the accessible entrance, thus rendering the interior of this unit of the Property, at best, dangerously accessible, at worst, totally inaccessible. This

violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xviii) Inside Rosalita's, the to-go/take-out counter lacking any portion of the counter that has a maximum height of 36 (thirty-six) inches from the finished floor in violation of section 904.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, all portions of the to-go/take-out counter exceed 36 (thirty-six) inches in height from the finished floor. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to properly transact business at the Property.

(xix) Inside Rosalita's, due to the policy of the operator/tenant to maximize the number of tables and chairs in the restaurant, the interior has walking surfaces lacking a 36 (thirty-six) inch clear width in violation of section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to properly utilize public features in the Property.

(xx) Near Rosalita's, there is at least one accessible parking space that does not have a properly marked access aisle in violation of section 502.3.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the accessible entrances of the Property.

(xxi) Near Rosalita's, there is a vertical rise exceeding $\frac{1}{4}$ inch at the top of the accessible ramp in violation of Section 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.

(xxii) The Property lacks an accessible route from the sidewalk to the accessible entrance in violation of section 206.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxiii) Because not all entrance doors and doorways comply with section 404 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, this is a violation of section 206.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access this Unit.

(xxiv) Defendant fails to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

(b) ROSALITA'S RESTROOMS

(i) The restroom lacks signage in compliance with sections 216.8 and 703 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to locate accessible restroom facilities.

(ii) The door exiting the men's restroom lacks a proper minimum maneuvering clearance, due to the proximity of the door hardware within 18 inches to the adjacent wall, in violation of section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

- (iii) The restrooms lack proper door hardware in violation of section 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to utilize the restroom facilities.
- (iv) The restrooms lack proper door hardware in violation of section 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to utilize the restroom facilities.
- (v) The lavatories and/or sinks in the restrooms have exposed pipes and surfaces and are not insulated or configured to protect against contact in violation of section 606.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (vi) The actionable mechanism of the paper towel dispenser in the restroom is located outside the prescribed vertical reach ranges set forth in section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (vii) The restrooms have grab bars adjacent to the commode which are not in compliance with section 604.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards as the rear bar is too short. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (viii) The side grab bars/handrails are too short and are not positioned in accordance with 609.4 and 604.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would

make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

(xxv) The hand operated flush control is not located on the open side of the accessible toilet in violation of section 604.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

32. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Rosalita's and Property.

33. Plaintiff requires an inspection of Rosalita's and Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Rosalita's and Property in violation of the ADA.

34. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

35. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to bring the Rosalita's and Property into compliance with the ADA.

36. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Rosalita's and Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

37. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers

and dangerous conditions present at the Rosalita's and Property is readily achievable because Defendants have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications.

38. Upon information and good faith belief, the Rosalita's and Property have been altered since 2010.

39. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

40. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Rosalita's and Property, including those alleged herein.

41. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

42. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendant.

43. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

44. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendant to modify the Rosalita's and Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Rosalita's in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant from

continuing their discriminatory practices;

- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendant to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Rosalita's to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: August 19, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dennis R. Kurz

Dennis R. Kurz

Attorney-in-Charge for Plaintiff

Texas State Bar ID No. 24068183

Kurz Law Group, LLC

4355 Cobb Parkway, Suite J-285

Atlanta, GA 30339

Tele: (404) 805-2494

Fax: (770) 428-5356

Email: dennis@kurzlawgroup.com